



U. S. Department of Transportation
Maritime Administration

February 2009

U.S. Public Port Development Expenditure Report (FYs 2006 & 2007-2011)



Cover photographs courtesy of (clockwise from top left):
Port of Long Beach, CA;
Port New Orleans, LA (lower left too);
Port of Morehead City, NC.

U.S. Public Port Development Expenditure Report (FYs 2006 & 2007-2011)

February 2009

U.S. Department of Transportation

Maritime Administration
Office of Intermodal System Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR U.S. PUBLIC PORT DEVELOPMENT	3
Capital Expenditures – 2006	3
Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category	4
Capital Expenditures – New Construction vs. Modernization/Rehabilitation.....	6
Projected Capital Expenditures – 2007 - 2011.....	8
Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category	8
METHODS OF FINANCING CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	11
APPENDIX A – Historical Data on Capital Expenditures and Funding Sources	A-1
Capital Expenditures – 2002 - 2006.....	A-1
Funding Sources – 2002 - 2006.....	A-2
APPENDIX B – AAPA Survey Respondents	B-1
APPENDIX C – Blank AAPA Port Expenditure Surveys (FYs 2006 & 2007-2011)	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 1946–2006 3
Table 2	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2006 5
Table 3	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2006 (Container & RO-RO/Auto) 5
Table 4	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Infrastructure for 2006 (On-Terminal vs. Off-Terminal) 6
Table 5	U.S. Public Port Capital Dredging Expenditures for 2006 (Improvement vs. Maintenance) 6
Table 6	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Expenditure and Facility for 2006 (New Construction & Modernization/Rehabilitation) 7
Table 7	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures for 2007–2011 8
Table 8	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2007–2011 9
Table 9	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2007–2011 (Container & RO-RO/Auto) 10
Table 10	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Types of Infrastructure for 2007–2011 (On-Terminal vs. Off-Terminal) 10
Table 11	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2006 11
Table 12	U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2007–2011 12
Table A1	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 2002–2006 A-1
Table A2	U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2002–2006 A-2

INTRODUCTION

This report is the result of a cooperative effort between the Maritime Administration and the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA). It was prepared by the Maritime Administration, using expenditure information furnished by AAPA. The survey data were obtained by AAPA from its U.S. corporate membership – public port agencies – which represent virtually all the major U.S. deep-draft coastal and Great Lakes ports. Public port agencies own approximately one-third of the U.S. deep-draft marine terminal facilities.

It is the only report of its kind in the port industry that covers capital expenditures at U.S. ports. Continuing a tradition first begun by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey in 1956, the Maritime Administration has been publishing this report since 1991.

This report includes fiscal year (FY) 2006 and projected five-year 2007-2011 expenditure data, along with the funding sources used to finance those expenditures. It aggregates data by geographical region, type of facility, on- and off-terminal infrastructure, dredging, security, and by new construction and modernization/rehabilitation.

It is important to note two characteristics about the data in this report – (1) they represent fiscal year (FY) data, and (2) ports have different fiscal years. (A fiscal year is defined as a 12-month period used to calculate annual financial reports. For example, a fiscal year ending June 30 extends from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the following year.) The table below shows the different fiscal years for the ports responding to the survey.

Fiscal Year (12 months ending...)	Port
June 30	Massachusetts (Boston), Maryland (Baltimore), Philadelphia, Wilmington (DE), Richmond (VA), Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Gulfport, New Orleans, Port Lavaca, St. Bernard, Portland (OR), Los Angeles, Redwood City, San Diego, Stockton, Ponce
July 31	Port Arthur
September 30	Canaveral, Everglades, Miami, Alabama, Freeport, Orange (TX)
December 31	Greater Baton Rouge, Corpus Christi, Houston, Greater Lafourche, Lake Charles, Grays Harbor, Seattle, Vancouver (USA), Cleveland

A special appreciation is extended to the 35 ports that returned the FY 2006 survey. This report's response rate is 41 percent (35 respondents out of 85 AAPA U.S. members), which is slightly higher than the FY 2005 report response rate (38 percent), but much lower than the FY 2003 report response rate of 55 percent. To put this report's response rate in context, the 35 respondents represented –

- 17 out of the top 30 U.S. container ports in 2006
- 16 out of the top 30 U.S. ports in 2006 handling foreign and domestic waterborne cargo

The report is available electronically online ([link to 2006 expenditure report](#)). For further information, contact the Maritime Administration; Office of Intermodal System Development; 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE (#W21-201, MAR-540); Washington, DC 20590; phone: 202-366-2320; fax: 202-366-6988; or email: ports.marad@dot.gov.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR U.S. PUBLIC PORT DEVELOPMENT

From 1946 through 2006, \$31.2 billion in capital improvements to port facilities and related infrastructure were reported by U.S. survey respondents. Table 1 summarizes the historical expenditures by coastal region. Investments reported by survey respondents over the five years (2002-2006) account for 24 percent of historical expenditures. These investments cover expenditures for the construction of new facilities and the modernization and rehabilitation of existing ones. During this 60-year period, the South Pacific region accounted for over one-third (34.1%). The top three regions (South Pacific, Gulf, and North Atlantic) together accounted for 69 percent of historical expenditures.

Table 1[‡]
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 1946 – 2006
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Expenditures	Percent
North Atlantic	\$5,404,975	17.3%
South Atlantic	\$4,705,285	15.1%
Gulf	\$5,486,958	17.6%
South Pacific	\$10,658,586	34.1%
North Pacific	\$3,196,465	10.2%
Great Lakes	\$581,725	1.9%
Non-contiguous*	\$995,835	3.2%
Guam, Saipan	\$193,242	0.6%
Total	\$31,223,070	100.0%

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, & Virgin Islands.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES – 2006

This section discusses the U.S. public port capital expenditures for FY 2006. The public port industry's annual capital expenditures as reported by the 35 respondents (out of 85 AAPA U.S. members) exceeded the one billion-dollar mark for the eleventh year. The 2006 expenditures totaled \$1.1 billion. This level of investment reflects the public port industry's efforts to address the increasing demands being placed on waterborne transportation through improvements to their marine terminal facilities and related land and waterside connections, as well as meeting today's need for enhanced port security. Appendix B contains a list of the 35 ports that responded to the 2006 expenditure survey.

Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category

Table 2 provides a breakdown of capital expenditures by expenditure category. Definitions of types of expenditure categories follow. Readers are invited to refer to the FY 2006 survey instrument itself in Appendix C.

- Each cargo facility type (general cargo, specialized general cargo, dry and liquid bulk, and passenger) includes expenditures for pier or wharf structures, handling equipment and open and closed storage facilities.
- “Specialized general cargo” includes container, roll-on/roll-off (RO-RO), and auto facilities.
- “Other” includes structures, land, and fixtures not directly related to the movement of cargo, such as maintenance and administrative facilities.
- “Infrastructure” expenditures cover improvements, such as roadways, rail, pipeline and utilities that are located on- or off-terminal property. The key distinction between on-terminal versus off-terminal is whether the expenditure was on port-owned property (i.e., on-terminal).
- “Dredging” consists of local port expenditures associated with the deepening and/or maintenance of federal and non-federal channels, connecting channels, and berths, as well as local costs for land, easements, rights-of-way, disposal areas, and mitigation.
- “Security” includes federal and local share expenditures for all security-related capital expenditure projects (e.g., fencing, access controls, lighting, surveillance, etc.). Operational expenses are not included.

As shown in Table 2, specialized general cargo facilities (which include container and RO-RO/auto facilities) were the leading expenditure category, both overall and among the six facility types, accounting for over one-third (\$361 million or 33.3%) of 2006 capital investments.

Table 3 shows the breakout of specialized general cargo facilities into two components (container and RO-RO/auto facilities) and supports the importance of containerization to the port industry and to the nation. Nearly all specialized general cargo expenditures in 2006 (94.4%) were spent on container facilities.

Table 2^{† 1}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2006
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Type of Facility						Infrastructure		Dredging	Security	Total
	General Cargo	Specialized General Cargo	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other*	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal			
North Atlantic	\$81,412	\$664	\$0	\$0	\$2,067	\$309	\$208	\$0	\$30,446	\$3,799	\$118,905
South Atlantic	14,303	157,697	2,550	3,286	25,440	30,409	8,874	1,814	47,782	17,619	309,774
Gulf	49,393	123,353	28,449	539	26,960	63,578	28,276	16,810	40,309	17,464	395,131
South Pacific	1,708	24,049	385	3,703	1,959	46,323	3,292	11,294	16,479	5,588	114,780
North Pacific	27,858	55,006	1,998	0	199	46,434	2,214	121	9,050	2,971	145,851
Total	\$174,674	\$360,769	\$33,382	\$7,528	\$56,625	\$187,053	\$42,864	\$30,039	\$144,066	\$47,441	\$1,084,441
Percent	16.1%	33.3%	3.1%	0.7%	5.2%	17.2%	4.0%	2.8%	13.3%	4.4%	100.0%

† Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* Respondent ports included the following expenses under "Other" – ref. and AC, equipment (computer, maintenance, etc.) , buildings/improvements (maintenance, fire station, administration, etc.), real estate development, crane electrification conversion, customer facilities, terminal development, maintenance, administration, property/infrastructure, land, new accounting system, HVAC system, new roof on administration building, feasibility study, marinas, moorage, fireboats, environmental, recreation, information technology, and boat launch. A number of ports did not define "other" at all.

Table 3[†]
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2006
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Specialized General Cargo		Total	Percent
	Container	RO-RO/Auto		
North Atlantic	\$664	\$0	\$664	0.2%
South Atlantic	156,767	930	157,697	43.7%
Gulf	110,996	12,357	123,353	34.2%
South Pacific	24,049	0	24,049	6.7%
North Pacific	48,163	6,843	55,006	15.2%
Total	\$340,639	\$20,130	\$360,769	100.0%
Percent	94.4%	5.6%	100.0%	

† Totals may not add up due to rounding.

¹ Tables 2 and 3 exclude \$56,305,000 and \$42,000,000, respectively, in expenditures from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each).

Table 4^{‡ 2}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Infrastructure for 2006
On-Terminal vs. Off-Terminal
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	On-Terminal				Off-Terminal				Total
	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other*	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other**	
North Atlantic	\$4	\$0	\$182	\$22	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$208
South Atlantic	1,504	3,516	1,132	2,722	1,315	0	499	0	10,688
Gulf	15,094	8,499	2,131	2,552	14,494	2,306	0	10	45,086
South Pacific	0	2,012	8	1,272	8,035	61	792	2,406	14,586
North Pacific	0	1,806	281	127	0	121	0	0	2,335
Total	\$16,602	\$15,833	\$3,734	\$6,695	\$23,844	\$2,488	\$1,291	\$2,416	\$72,903
Percent	38.7%	36.9%	8.7%	15.6%	79.4%	8.3%	4.3%	8.0%	
	59%				41%				100%

‡ Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* On-terminal "other" was defined by survey respondents as electric/fire protection/plumbing, land purchase, lighting, paving, pipeline, manlift, miscellaneous, storm damage, jet array system. A number of ports did not define "other" at all.

** Off-terminal "other" was defined by survey respondents as pipeline, doors, building upgrades, and roof. A number of ports did not define "other" at all.

Table 5[‡]
U.S. Public Port Capital Dredging Expenditures for 2006
Improvement vs. Maintenance
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Improvement	Maintenance	Total	Percent
North Atlantic	\$2,816	\$27,630	\$30,446	21.1%
South Atlantic	32,978	14,804	47,782	33.2%
Gulf	11,969	28,340	40,309	28.0%
South Pacific	13,499	2,980	16,479	11.4%
North Pacific	1,018	8,032	9,050	6.3%
Total	\$62,280	\$81,786	\$144,066	100.0%
Percent	43.2%	56.8%	100.0%	

‡ Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Capital Expenditures – New Construction vs. Modernization/Rehabilitation

Table 6 summarizes 2006 capital expenditures in two ways – by new construction and by modernization/rehabilitation (mod/rehab). For 2006, expenditures on new construction were roughly double those of mod/rehab (63.6% vs. 36.4%, respectively). Container facilities were an important expenditure category, being the largest category in new construction and the second largest in mod/rehab.

² Table 5 excludes \$14,000,000 in expenditures from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each.

Table 6^{† 3}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Expenditure and Facility for 2006
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	NEW CONSTRUCTION												Total
	General Cargo	Type of Facility				Infrastructure		Dredging		Security			
		Special. Gen'l Cargo Container	RO-RO/ Auto	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal		Improvement	Maint.	
North Atlantic	\$39,830	\$664	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$292	\$140	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,799	\$44,725
South Atlantic	5,799	111,149	925	553	0	22,453	27,417	2,711	1,224	10,576	0	9,440	\$192,247
Gulf	22,833	108,801	12,357	21,267	374	26,928	54,523	17,961	852	10,046	25,984	16,534	\$318,460
South Pacific	0	7,042	0	0	0	1,837	33,452	79	8,763	13,359	1,500	5,295	\$71,327
North Pacific	4,026	33,693	1,103	1,532	0	199	9,436	888	121	1,018	7,512	2,971	\$62,499
Total	\$72,488	\$261,349	\$14,385	\$23,352	\$374	\$51,417	\$125,120	\$21,779	\$10,960	\$34,999	\$34,996	\$38,039	\$689,258
Percent	10.5%	37.9%	2.1%	3.4%	0.1%	7.5%	18.2%	3.2%	1.6%	5.1%	5.1%	5.5%	

Region	MODERNIZATION / REHABILITATION												Total
	General Cargo	Type of Facility				Infrastructure		Dredging		Security			
		Special. Gen'l Cargo Container	RO-RO/ Auto	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal		Improvement	Maint.	
North Atlantic	\$41,582	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,067	\$17	\$68	\$0	\$2,816	\$27,630	\$0	\$74,180
South Atlantic	8,505	45,616	5	1,997	3,286	2,987	2,993	6,164	590	22,401	14,804	8,179	117,527
Gulf	26,561	2,195	0	7,182	165	32	9,054	10,316	15,958	1,922	2,357	929	76,671
South Pacific	1,708	17,007	0	385	3,703	122	12,871	3,214	2,531	140	1,480	293	43,454
North Pacific	23,833	14,470	5,740	466	0	0	36,998	1,325	0	0	520	0	83,352
Total	\$102,189	\$79,288	\$5,745	\$10,030	\$7,154	\$5,208	\$61,933	\$21,087	\$19,079	\$27,279	\$46,791	\$9,401	\$395,184
Percent	25.9%	20.1%	1.5%	2.5%	1.8%	1.3%	15.7%	5.3%	4.8%	6.9%	11.8%	2.4%	

† Totals may not add up due to rounding.

³ Table 6 excludes \$56,305,000 in expenditures from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each.

PROJECTED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES – 2007-2011

The 2006 AAPA capital expenditure survey asked for projected expenditures for FYs 2007-2011. Table 7 summarizes reported expenditures by coastal region. During this five-year period, public port expenditures are projected to reach \$9.4 billion. Appendix B contains a list of the 34 survey respondents (out of 85 AAPA U.S. members).

Of the eight regions below, three predict expenditures greater than \$2 billion (South Atlantic with over \$3 billion, and the Gulf and South Pacific each over \$2 billion). Three regions (North Atlantic, North Pacific, and Great Lakes) estimate expenditures under \$1 billion. The final two regions (Non-contiguous and Guam/Saipan) had no respondents.

Table 7[‡]
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures for 2007-2011
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Expenditures	Percent
North Atlantic	\$887,484	9.5%
South Atlantic	3,437,580	36.6%
Gulf	2,195,207	23.4%
South Pacific	2,073,674	22.1%
North Pacific	790,681	8.4%
Great Lakes	615	0.0%
Non-contiguous*	0	0.0%
Guam, Saipan	0	0.0%
Total	\$9,385,241	100.0%

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, & Virgin Islands

Capital Expenditures – By Expenditure Category

Table 8 shows projected future expenditures by expenditure category from 2007-2011. At 30.2 percent, ports expect to invest heavily in specialized general cargo facilities (which include container and RO-RO/auto facilities), projecting expenditures of \$2.8 billion. This is similar to 2006 experience seen in Table 2 (on page 5).

Table 8^{‡ 4}
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Expenditure Category for 2007-2011
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Type of Facility						Infrastructure		Dredging	Security	Total
	General Cargo	Specialized General Cargo	Dry Bulk	Liquid Bulk	Passenger	Other*	On-Terminal	Off-Terminal			
North Atlantic	\$359,839	\$58,845	\$0	\$0	\$11,667	\$54,030	\$4,218	\$50	\$376,463	\$22,372	\$887,484
South Atlantic	287,119	1,321,363	10,090	71,847	241,974	805,529	195,044	26,241	431,345	47,028	3,437,580
Gulf	600,886	621,525	76,605	162,800	23,215	260,251	166,552	69,127	106,910	107,336	2,195,207
South Pacific	58	550,630	14,606	50,414	182,523	806,527	168,007	188,510	30,982	81,417	2,073,674
North Pacific	46,787	279,054	17,800	1,500	68,350	203,956	90,175	52,269	19,126	11,664	790,681
Total	\$1,294,689	\$2,831,417	\$119,101	\$286,561	\$527,729	\$2,130,293	\$623,996	\$336,197	\$964,826	\$269,817	\$9,384,626
Percent	13.8%	30.2%	1.3%	3.1%	5.6%	22.7%	6.6%	3.6%	10.3%	2.9%	100.0%

‡ Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* "Other" was defined by survey respondents as land, equipment (computer, etc.), facilities (maintenance, administration, customer, ferry, equipment, etc.), Lab/OHD/Int., consulting, cranes (gantry, container, etc.), terminal development, maintenance, administration and other operational costs, Cranes, barge fleet, steel slab facility, distribution centers, building improvements, property/infrastructure, port administration, relocate main gate, construct new port office, CDF dike construction, disposal of tanks, dump trash, marinas, moorage, other real estate, fireboats, environmental, recreation, public access, boat launch, and electrical upgrades. A few ports did not define "other" at all.

6

⁴ Table 8 excludes \$615,000 in expenditures from the Great Lakes region, which had fewer than three responses.

Table 9 breaks out specialized general cargo facility projected 2007-2011 investments by type of specialized general cargo facility: container versus RO-RO/auto. Nearly all (95.3%) responding ports preferred container facilities, which is similar to 2006 experience (Table 3 on page 5).

Table 9[‡]
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of
Specialized General Cargo Facility for 2007-2011
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Container	RO-RO/Auto	Total	Percent
North Atlantic	\$52,670	\$6,175	\$58,845	2.1%
South Atlantic	1,259,733	61,630	1,321,363	46.7%
Gulf	567,355	54,170	621,525	22.0%
South Pacific	550,630	0	550,630	19.4%
North Pacific	268,901	10,153	279,054	9.9%
Total	\$2,699,289	\$132,128	\$2,831,417	100.0%
Percent	95.3%	4.7%	100.0%	

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Table 10 examines the five-year projected infrastructure investments. It breaks down on- and off-terminal infrastructure investments into four subcategories – road, rail, utilities, and “other.” Nearly two-thirds of expenditures are projected to be invested in on-terminal infrastructure.

Table 10[‡]
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of Infrastructure for 2007-2011
On-Terminal vs. Off-Terminal
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	On-Terminal				Off-Terminal				Total
	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other*	Road	Rail	Utilities	Other**	
North Atlantic	\$0	\$0	\$4,218	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50	\$4,268
South Atlantic	6,596	122,806	37,666	27,976	12,147	0	14,094	0	221,285
Gulf	54,677	53,899	15,720	42,256	44,956	3,870	0	20,301	235,679
South Pacific	260	137,418	2,390	27,939	166,816	1,909	14,001	5,784	356,517
North Pacific	2,030	85,055	1,940	1,150	0	52,269	0	0	142,444
Total	\$63,563	\$399,178	\$61,934	\$99,321	\$223,919	\$58,048	\$28,095	\$26,135	\$960,193
Percent	10.2%	64.0%	9.9%	15.9%	66.6%	17.3%	8.4%	7.8%	
	65%				35%				100%

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* On-terminal “other” was defined as sheetpile wall, terminal entrances, environmental improvements, bulkhead, lighting, paving, pipeline, land and stabilization, storm damage, jet array system, and conveyor and dock upgrades. A number of ports did not define “other” at all.

** Off-terminal “other” was defined as truck scale, disposal island and levees, site development, pipeline, roofing, fireline. A number of ports did not define “other” at all.

METHODS OF FINANCING CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

The 2006 / 2007-2011 AAPA expenditure survey respondents (35 out of 85 AAPA U.S. members) also provided information on the methods they used to finance their capital investments. They used six funding categories to classify the financing methods: port revenues, general obligation bonds (GO bonds), revenue bonds, loans, grants, and "other." Funding category definitions follow.

- "Port Revenues" are income generated by the port through its operations.
- "General Obligation (or GO) Bonds" are issued by a state, city, or local government. They are secured by the taxing and borrowing power of the issuing jurisdiction, rather than the revenue from a given project.
- "Revenue Bonds" are issued by a state, city, or local government to finance public works projects. Bond principal and interest are secured by the revenues of a given project.
- "Loans" are money that an entity owes a lender. They can be short or long term, based on when they will be paid off. This financial transaction is provided at a cost, referred to as interest on the debt.
- A "grant" is a contribution of cash by one government entity (or other organization) to another. Many times these contributions are made to local governments from state and federal governments. Grants are used to support a public purpose and do not have to be repaid.
- "Other" includes all financing sources that were not described above, such as transportation trust funds, state appropriations, insurance, and taxes. The specifics of what is included in this category are footnoted in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11^{‡ 5}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2006
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Facility Expenditures by Financing Method												
	Port Revenues	Pct.	GO Bonds	Pct.	Revenue Bonds	Pct.	Loans	Pct.	Grants	Pct.	Other*	Pct.	Total
North Atlantic	\$481	0.1%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$3,400	5.2%	\$1,796	1.7%	\$96,484	46.1%	\$102,161
South Atlantic	107,295	24.7%	41,560	31.1%	52,831	45.2%	45,972	70.9%	17,719	16.4%	44,397	21.2%	309,774
Gulf	179,402	41.3%	91,244	68.3%	0	0.0%	14,514	22.4%	82,147	75.9%	27,824	13.3%	395,131
South Pacific	101,599	23.4%	0	0.0%	6,875	5.9%	946	1.5%	5,360	5.0%	0	0.0%	114,780
North Pacific	45,887	10.6%	833	0.6%	57,241	48.9%	0	0.0%	1,213	1.1%	40,677	19.4%	145,851
Total	\$434,664	100.0%	\$133,637	100.0%	\$116,947	100.0%	\$64,832	100.0%	\$108,235	100.0%	\$209,382	100.0%	\$1,067,697
Percent	40.7%		12.5%		11.0%		6.1%		10.1%		19.6%		100.0%

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* "Other" was defined as Transportation Trust Fund – Special Revenue, state capital funds, grant state bond bill, federal, local county grant, Army Corps of Engineers, state appropriations, insurance, state , CPF, priority transportation, FEMA, private partner, contract dredging, tax levy, cash. A few respondents did not define "other" at all.

⁵ Table 11 excludes a total of \$73,049,000 in 2006 funding sources [\$16,744,000 for which there was no information on funding source, and \$56,305,000 from two regions (Great Lakes and Non-contiguous) that had fewer than three responses each].

Table 12^{‡ 6}
U.S. Public Port Projected Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2007-2011
(Thousands of Dollars)

Region	Facility Expenditures by Financing Method												Total
	Port Revenues	Pct.	GO Bonds	Pct.	Revenue Bonds	Pct.	Loans	Pct.	Grants	Pct.	Other*	Pct.	
N. Atlantic	\$10,069	0.2%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$600	0.3%	\$7,893	1.1%	\$732,978	34.1%	\$751,540
S. Atlantic	1,073,041	25.3%	139,177	21.5%	801,784	64.0%	206,575	89.3%	311,692	42.4%	905,311	42.1%	3,437,580
Gulf	1,018,294	24.1%	238,615	36.8%	249,000	19.9%	4,433	1.9%	294,646	40.1%	390,219	18.2%	2,195,207
S. Pacific	1,951,152	46.1%	0	0.0%	22,294	1.8%	10,000	4.3%	87,850	12.0%	2,378	0.1%	2,073,674
N. Pacific	180,653	4.3%	270,871	41.8%	179,696	14.3%	9,600	4.2%	32,819	4.5%	117,042	5.4%	790,681
Total	\$4,233,209	100.0%	\$648,663	100.0%	\$1,252,774	100.0%	\$231,208	100.0%	\$734,900	100.0%	\$2,147,928	100.0%	\$9,248,682
Percent	45.8%		7.0%		13.5%		2.5%		7.9%		23.2%		100.0%

‡ Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* "Other" was defined as transportation trust fund, certificate of participation, state capital funds, grant state bond bill, master lease, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, tenant financing, state, MELP & CP program, CPF/CPF bond, insurance, FEMA, public sector partners, private, federal, tax levy, CIP, Water Emergency Transit Authority, rental credits, Navy remediation funds, One respondent indicated the source was under review. A few respondents did not define "other" at all.

⁶ Table 12 excludes \$136,559,000 in 2007-2011 funding sources (\$135,944,000 for which there was no data on funding source, and \$615,000 from the Great Lakes region that had fewer than three responses).

Appendix A – Historical Data on Capital Expenditures and Funding Sources

Capital Expenditures – 2002-2006

Table A1 shows the annual expenditures from 2002 to 2006 broken down by region. No attempt is made to analyze this time series data, as the number and composition of ports responding each year differed, thus rendering analysis impossible.

Table A1[‡]
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures for 2002-2006
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Region	2002		2003		2004		2005		2006	
	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd	Expenditure	No. of Surveys Rec'd
North Atlantic	\$336,223	8	\$385,284	6	\$279,490	4	\$234,363	4	\$118,905	5
South Atlantic	159,834	7	304,651	8	221,054	6	249,840	6	309,774	7
Gulf	252,550	22	237,185	15	159,448	11	268,098	11	395,131	13
South Pacific	836,683	8	531,010	8	298,418	4	1,240,658	4	114,780	4
North Pacific	78,776	8	222,839	8	7,255	4	29,854	4	145,851	4
Great Lakes	310	2	2,980	1	7,925	2	5,960	2	305	1
Non-contiguous*	4,792	3	0	0	10,700	1	30,300	1	56,000	1
Guam, Saipan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	\$1,669,168	58	\$1,683,946	46	\$984,290	32	\$2,059,073	32	\$1,140,746	35
AAPA U.S. Members		84		84		85		85		85
Response Rate (%)		69%		55%		38%		38%		41%

[‡] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

* Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, & Virgin Islands.

Funding Sources – 2002-2006

Table A2 provides an historical summary of financing methods used from 2002-2006. No attempt is made to analyze this time series data, as the number and composition of ports responding each year differed, thus rendering analysis impossible.

Table A2^{† 7}
U.S. Public Port Capital Expenditures by Type of Financing Method for 2002-2006
 (Thousands of Dollars)

Method	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Port Revenues	\$547,040	\$751,044	\$299,667	\$1,422,016	\$434,969
GO Bonds	334,372	206,051	345,837	348,696	133,637
Revenue Bonds	188,120	223,557	183,794	107,979	116,947
Loans	60,281	45,429	8,467	7,306	120,832
Grants	110,047	100,005	72,909	94,191	108,235
Other	187,076	191,299	56,304	69,874	209,382
Total	\$1,426,936	\$1,517,385	\$966,978	\$2,050,063	\$1,124,002
No. of Surveys Rec'd	58	46	32	32	35
AAPA U.S. Members	84	84	85	85	85
Response Rate (%)	69%	55%	38%	38%	41%

[†] Totals may not add up due to rounding.

⁷ Table A2 excludes the following expenditures for which there was no information on funding source:
 2002 - \$242,232,000 2003 - \$166,561,000 2004 - \$17,312,000 2005 - \$9,009,000
 2006 - \$16,744,000

Appendix B – AAPA Survey Respondents⁸

Respondent	2006 Survey	2007 – 2011 Survey
North Atlantic		
Albany Port District Commission	-	-
Diamond State Port Corp. (Wilmington, DE)	X	X
Maryland Port Administration (Baltimore)	X	X
Massachusetts Port Authority (Boston)	X	X
Philadelphia Regional Port Authority	X	X
Port of Richmond (VA)	X	X
South Jersey Port Corporation	-	-
The Port Authority of New York & New Jersey	-	-
South Atlantic		
Canaveral Port Authority	X	X
Georgia Ports Authority	X	X
Jacksonville Port Authority	-	-
North Carolina State Ports Authority	X	X
Port Everglades	X	X
Port of Miami	X	X
Port of Palm Beach	-	-
South Carolina State Ports Authority	X	X
Virginia Port Authority	X	X
Gulf		
Alabama State Port Authority	X	X
Greater Baton Rouge Port Commission	X	X
Greater Lafourche Port Commission	X	X
Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District	X	X
Mississippi State Port Authority at Gulfport	X	X
Panama City Port Authority	-	-
Plaquemines Port Authority	-	-
Port Manatee	-	-
Port of Beaumont	-	-
Port of Brownsville	-	-
Port of Corpus Christi Authority	X	X
Port of Freeport	X	X
Port of Galveston	-	-
Port of Houston Authority	X	X
Port of New Orleans	X	X
Port of Orange	X	X
Port of Pascagoula	-	-
Port of Pensacola	-	-
Port of Port Arthur	X	X
Port of Port Lavaca / Point Comfort	X	X
Port of South Louisiana	-	-
St. Bernard Port, Harbor & Terminal District	X	X
Tampa Port Authority	-	-

⁸ A dash (-) indicates survey not returned.

Respondent	2006 Survey	2007 – 2011 Survey
South Pacific		
Port of Hueneme/Oxnard Harbor District	-	-
Port of Humboldt Bay	-	-
Port of Long Beach	-	-
Port of Los Angeles	X	X
Port of Oakland	-	-
Port of Redwood City	X	X
Port of Sacramento	-	-
Port of Stockton	X	X
San Diego Unified Port District	X	X
San Francisco	-	-
North Pacific		
Port of Bellingham	-	-
Port of Coos Bay	-	-
Port of Everett	-	-
Port of Grays Harbor	X	X
Port of Kalama	-	-
Port of Longview	-	-
Port of Olympia	-	-
Port of Portland (OR)	X	X
Port of Seattle	X	X
Port of Tacoma	-	-
Port of Vancouver (USA)	X	X
Great Lakes		
Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority	X	X
Detroit/Wayne County Port Authority	-	-
Duluth Seaway Port Authority	-	-
Indiana Port Commission	-	-
Port of Chicago	-	-
Port of Green Bay	-	-
Port of Milwaukee	-	-
Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	-	-
Non-Contiguous		
Anchorage	-	-
Commonwealth Port Authority of Saipan	-	-
Hawaii DOT	-	-
Port Authority of Guam	-	-
Port of Ponce, PR	X	-
Puerto Rico Ports Authority	-	-
Virgin Islands Port Authority	-	-

Appendix C

AAPA PORT EXPENDITURE SURVEY - FY 2006 (U.S. ports only)

For the fiscal year ended: _____, 2006

Port Name: _____ Date: _____

Prepared by: _____ Title: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

FACILITY TYPE	NEW CONSTRUCTION (Actual US\$)	MODERNIZATION/ REHABILITATION (Actual US\$)	TOTAL EXPENDITURES (Actual US\$)	
General Cargo ¹	.00	.00	0.00	
Specialized General Cargo ¹ :				
Container ONLY	.00	.00	0.00	
RO/RO, auto, etc.			0.00	
Dry Bulk Cargo ¹			0.00	
Liquid Bulk Cargo ¹			0.00	
Passenger or Cruise ¹			0.00	
Infrastructure Improvements ²				
On-Terminal				
Highway	.00	.00	0.00	
Rail			0.00	
Utilities			0.00	
Other ()			0.00	
Off-Terminal				
Highway			0.00	
Rail			0.00	
Utilities			0.00	
Other ()			0.00	
Dredging				
Improvement ³			0.00	
Maintenance ⁴			0.00	
Security ⁵			0.00	
Other ⁶				
(Specify:)			0.00	0.00
(Specify:)			0.00	0.00
(Specify:)			0.00	0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (FY 2006) (must equal Total Funding Sources)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00

FUNDING SOURCES FOR FY 2006 EXPENDITURES	DOLLAR AMOUNT (Actual US\$)
Internal Revenues (Earned Income)	.00
General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds	.00
Revenue Bonds	.00
Loans (Source:)	.00
Grants (Source:)	.00
Other (Source:)	.00
(Source:)	.00
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES (FY 2006) (must equal Total Expenditures)	\$0.00

Notes:

General – For each category listed under Facility Type, show the total amount expended and the amounts associated with new construction and/or modernization/rehabilitation.

1. Includes expenditures for piers, wharves, handling equipment, and open and closed storage facilities.
2. "Infrastructure Improvements" include expenditures for road, rail, pipeline, and utility improvements. The key distinction between on-terminal vs. off-terminal is whether the expenditure was on port-owned property (i.e., on-terminal).
3. "Improvement" includes local costs for both federal and connecting channels, berths, disposal sites, and mitigation.
4. "Maintenance" includes local costs for connecting channels, berths, disposal sites, and mitigation.
5. "Security" includes federal & local share expenditures for all security-related capital expenditure projects (e.g., fencing, CCTV, access controls, lighting, command & control, etc.). Operational expenses not included.
6. "Other" includes expenditures for any structures, land, and fixtures not related to cargo movement, such as maintenance or administrative facilities.

AAPA PORT EXPENDITURE SURVEY – Projections for FYs 2007-2011 (U.S. ports only)

Port Name: _____ Date: _____

Prepared by: _____ Title: _____
 Phone: _____ Email: _____

FACILITY TYPE		TOTAL EXPENDITURES
General Cargo ¹		.00
Specialized General Cargo ¹ :		
	Container ONLY	.00
	RO/RO, auto, etc.	
Dry Bulk Cargo ¹		
Liquid Bulk Cargo ¹		
Passenger or Cruise ¹		
Infrastructure Improvements ² :		
On-Terminal	Highway	.00
	Rail	
	Utilities	
	Other ()	
Off-Terminal	Highway	
	Rail	
	Utilities	
	Other ()	
Dredging ³		
Security ⁴		
Other ⁵	(Specify:)	
	(Specify:)	
	(Specify:)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (FYs 2007-2011) (must equal Total Funding Sources)		\$0.00

0.00

FUNDING SOURCES FOR FYs 2007-2011 EXPENDITURES		DOLLAR AMOUNT (Actual US\$)
Internal Revenues (Earned Income)		.00
General Obligation (G.O.) Bonds		.00
Revenue Bonds		.00
Loans	(Source:)	.00
Grants	(Source:)	.00
Other	(Source:)	.00
	(Source:)	.00
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES (FYs 2007-2011) (must equal Total Expenditures)		\$0.00

0.00

0.00

Notes:

General – For each category listed under Facility Type, show the total amount expended.

1. Includes expenditures for piers, wharves, handling equipment, and open and closed storage facilities.
2. "Infrastructure Improvements" include expenditures for road, rail, pipeline, and utility improvements. The key distinction between on-terminal vs. off-terminal is whether the expenditure was on port-owned property (i.e., on-terminal).
3. "Dredging" includes local costs (maintenance and improvement dredging) for both federal and connecting channels, berths, disposal sites, and mitigation.
4. "Security" includes federal & local share expenditures for all security-related capital expenditure projects (e.g., fencing, CCTV, access controls, lighting, command & control, etc.). Operational expenses not included.
5. "Other" includes expenditures for any structures, land, and fixtures not related to cargo movement, such as maintenance or administrative facilities.



U.S. Department of Transportation
Maritime Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue
Washington, DC 20590